



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,168	12/21/2000	Armando Paul Stettner	005217.P021	1237
33318	7590	03/01/2005	EXAMINER	
DIGEO, INC.			CHANG, JUNGWON	
8815 122ND NE			ART UNIT	
KIRKLAND, WA 98033			PAPER NUMBER	

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/747,168

Applicant(s)

STETTNER, ARMANDO PAUL

Examiner

Jungwon Chang

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2004.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

42

**FINAL ACTION**

1. This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 10/19/2004. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.
2. The rejection of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is withdrawn based on the amendment filed on 10/19/2004.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in the prior office action.
4. Claims 1-3, 5, 9-12, 15-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshinobu (US 5,794,118).
5. As to claim 1, Yoshinobu discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method comprising:  
  
for each participant desiring to provide input (user input means for inputting...a reply to a question or reply data; col. 5, lines 4-8; inputting information; col. 6, lines 52-54);  
  
receiving participant input for a show (receiving apparatus; col. 5, lines 3-8; col. 6, lines 52-56) and subsequently disconnecting a communication with a participant that submitted the participant input (153, fig. 6; col. 17, lines 21-25);

storing the participant input in a storage location (col. 5, lines 14-28; col. 6, lines 57-65; col. 14, lines 27-36; col. 30, lines 21-22 and 25-26);

automatically processing the stored participant input to determine a relationship of the participant input to the show (i.e., determining whether the user's input is responding to a particular show; col. 16, lines 39-45; col. 5, lines 20-28); and

based on the determined relationship, alerting the participant that submitted the participant input if the participant input is selected for the show (i.e., notifying the participants who are allowed to interact with the show; col. 5, lines 20-28; col. 17, lines 30-36; col. 20, line 48 – col. 21, line 52; col. 30, lines 31-33; col. 1, lines 46-56).

6. As to claim 2, Yoshinobu discloses prior to receiving the participant input for the show, notifying the participant of an availability of the show to receive the participant input (col. 1, lines 48-50; col. 11, lines 6-23).

7. As to claim 3, Yoshinobu discloses a television or radio show (col. 1, lines 46-48).

8. As to claim 5, Yoshinobu disclose subsequent to alerting the participant, receiving additional participant input from the participant (i.e., receiving new participant input; col. 17, lines 53-56; col. 20, line 48 – col. 21, line 52; col. 1, lines 46-56).

9. As to claims 9-11, Yoshinobu discloses alerting the participant (i.e., notifying the

Art Unit: 2154

participants; col. 5, lines 20-28; col. 17, lines 30-36; col. 20, line 48 – col. 21, line 52; col. 1, lines 46-56) and the participant input is capable of being received via a telephone call (i.e., bi-direction telephone communication; col. 6, lines 47-56; col. 8, lines 18-25 and 45-55).

10. As to claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, Yoshinobu discloses a machine-readable medium (i.e., RAM or ROM) having stored thereon instruction (col. 12, lines 45-56).

11. As to claim 15, Yoshinobu discloses collecting the participant input submitted for the show includes instructions to correlated the participant input according to predefined criteria (col. 5, lines 4-8 and 14-28; col. 6, lines 52-65; col. 14, lines 27-36; col. 30, lines 21-22 and 25-26).

12. As to claim 16, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, Yoshinobu discloses a server (i.e., broadcasting system) to receive participant input for a show (col. 5, lines 4-8; col. 6, lines 52-56); storage unit to store the participant input received by the server (col. 5, lines 14-28; col. 6, lines 57-65; col. 14, lines 27-36; col. 30, lines 21-22 and 25-26); and an alert generator to generate and transmit an alert to the participant terminal (i.e., notifying the participants; col. 5, lines 20-28; col. 17, lines 30-36; col. 20, line 48 – col. 21, line 52; col. 30, lines 31-33; col. 1, lines 46-56).

Art Unit: 2154

13. As to claim 17, Yoshinobu discloses an interactive video casting network (col. coupled to provide the show to the participant terminal (col. 19, lines 25-28 and 51-55).

14. As to claim 19, Yoshinobu further discloses a monitor coupled to the storage unit to control processing of the participant input stored in the storage unit and to control operation of the server (i.e., control system; col. 12, line 45 – col. 13, line 12).

15. As to claim 20, Yoshinobu discloses server (i.e., broadcasting system) is capable to store the received participant input information into the storage unit according to predefined criteria (col. 5, lines 14-28; col. 6, lines 57-65; col. 14, lines 27-36; col. 30, lines 21-22 and 25-26).

16. Claims 4, 6, 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshinobu (US 5,794,118), in view of Walker et al. (US 6,425,828).

17. As to claim 4, Yoshinobu does not specifically disclose identifying an alert preference of the participant. However, Walker discloses a plurality of methods for alerting the participant (i.e., email, audible or visual alerts; col. 14, lines 33-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yoshinobu and Walker because Walker's a plurality of alerting methods would allow a user to select the alerting method in the way of user preference (i.e., email, audible or visual alerts; col. 14, lines 33-37).

Art Unit: 2154

18. As to claim 6, Yoshinobu does not specifically disclose alerting the participant that subject matter related to another participant's input is to be addressed in the show. However, Walker discloses alerting the participant that subject matter related to another participant's input is to be addressed in the show (col. 2, lines 1-5; col. 4, lines 24-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yoshinobu and Walker because Walker's subject matter related to another participant's input would allow the participant to know the type of topic or game that other user participates in the show.

19. As to claim 8, Yoshinobu does not specifically disclose human operator selecting the participant input for the show. However, Walker discloses human operator selecting the participant input for the show (col. 12, lines 24-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yoshinobu and Walker because Walker's human operator would allow the human operator to manually correct the decision that mistakes were made to select the participants for the show.

20. As to claim 13, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 4 above.

21. Claims 7, 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshinobu (US 5,794,118), Walker et al. (US 6,425,828), further in view of Omoigui (US 6,694,352).

22. As to claims 7, 14 and 18, Yoshinobu discloses performing a keyword search on the text format to classify the participant input relative to the show (i.e., the participant input is classified by the user's interactive television specification version, "00", as information regarding a shopping by way of television; col. 20, lines 48-56). However, Yoshinobu and Walker do not specifically disclose a speech recognition technique to convert an audio format of the participant input into a text format. Omoigui discloses a speech recognition technique to convert an audio format of the participant input into a text format. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yoshinobu, Walker and Omoigui because Omoigui's audio-text converter would properly translate the audio data into text data.

23. Applicant's arguments filed 9/16/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

24. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that:

- (1) Yoshinobu does not, "for each participant desiring to provide input", receive "participant input for a show."
- (2) Yoshinobu does not store "for each participants desiring to provide input...the participant input is in a storage location," as recited in claim 1.
- (3) Yoshinobu does not "automatically process the stored participant input to determine the relationship of the participant input to the show".



Art Unit: 2154

25. Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's remarks.

As to point (1), examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's argument. Yoshinobu clearly discloses for each participant desiring to provide input (user input means for inputting...a reply to a question or reply data; col. 5, lines 4-8; inputting information; col. 6, lines 52-54). Therefore, Yoshinobu is a relevant prior art.

As to point (2), examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's argument. Yoshinobu clearly discloses storing the participant input is in a storage location (DRAM, 23, fig. 7; SRAM, 24, fig. 7) (the reception data, i.e., participant input, are stored; col. 14, lines 27-36 and 43-54; data stored into the temporary storage area; col. 15, lines 4-32; col. 23, lines 43-51). Therefore, Yoshinobu is a relevant prior art.

As to point (3), Yoshinobu clearly discloses automatically processing the stored participant input to determine a relationship of the participant input to the show (i.e., determining whether received command is a responding command for responding to a quiz program; col. 16, lines 39-45; col. 17, lines 30-36 and 53-56). Therefore, Yoshinobu is a relevant prior art.

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2154

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jungwon Chang whose telephone number is (703)305-9669. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 (Monday-Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jungwon Chang  
February 17, 2005

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100